

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending. In the Office Action dated June 27, 2005 Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b), and Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). By way of this Amendment, Applicant hereby amends Claims 1, 6, 7, and 12. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

SECTION 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the limitation “securing element” lacked an antecedent basis in the independent Claims 1 and 7. Applicant further noticed that the limitation “securing element” was improperly used in Claims 6 and 12. Accordingly, the language of Claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 have been amended to include the limitation “securing member” instead of “securing element,” which has proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1-12, as amended, are not indefinite.

SECTION 102(B) REJECTIONS

Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Colton (U.S. Patent No. 5,218,760). The Office Action states that element 51a of Colton Fig. 2 was a component configured to move the securing member longitudinally within the groove of the base section and that elements 28 and 30 were force-producing devices for moving the securing member 48 closer to the first wall of the base section 54 as the first component 51a was adjusted.

Applicant submits that Colton fails to teach or suggest a first component configured to move the securing member longitudinally within the groove of the base section. Colton expressly teaches away from element 51a being configured to move a securing member longitudinally. Instead, Colton states, “The rear edge 48g of the printed circuit board 48 is *then secured by*

screw-mounting the rear edge 48g to a rear bracket (not shown) by inserting screws through apertures 64 where they may engage the rear bracket" (col. 6, line 48 and Figure 2). Also, Figure 2 shows that the screw is mounted through aperture 64 and a cross section of the member 48. Thus, element 51a is incapable of being configured to move the securing member longitudinally since Colton secures the member 48 by screw-mounting at a right angle to the base section groove.

Applicant submits that Colton fails to teach or suggest one or more force-producing devices for moving the securing member closer to the first wall of the base section as the first component is adjusted, the one or more force-producing devices being coupled to the base section. Elements 28 and 30 are not coupled to the base section (Figure 2, element 58). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 7 is allowable because every limitation of the claim is not identically and exactly taught without any difference. Thus, because Claims 8-12 depend from Claim 7, they are similarly allowable.

Claim 11 is allowable for the additional reason that Colton does not teach or suggest force-producing devices comprising a plurality of ramps located on the base section and the securing member. The Colton base section 54 and member 48 have no ramps.

SECTION 103(A) REJECTIONS

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Colton in view of Perotto (U.S. Patent No. 3,418,533). The Office Action stated that Colton disclosed all the subject matter of the claimed invention except for a securing element being monolithic and that Perotto disclosed a monolithic board.

Applicant submits that the combined references fail to teach or suggest every element of the claim because Perotto also fails to teach or suggest (1) a first component configured to move the securing member longitudinally within the groove of the base section or (2) one or more force-producing devices for moving the securing member closer to the first wall of the base

section as the first component is adjusted, the one or more force-producing devices being coupled to the base section.


Applicant submits that Perotto also fails to teach or suggest a monolithic securing member. Instead, Perotto merely teaches “electronic components grouped in monolithic elements, comprised in a modular structure...” (col. 2, line 61). The present invention is not concerned with electronic components grouped together, but rather a monolithic securing member.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims and drawings of the pending application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants’ agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}




Michael S. Smith
Registration No. 39,563
Direct Dial: 206.749.9888

MAIL CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this communication is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via first class mail under 37 C.F.R. § 1.08 on the date indicated below addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

8/19/05
Date of Deposit


Michelle J. Carman